

## Remarks

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated November 14, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 14, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 4, 15, and 28 are amended to be placed in independent form. Claim 6 is amended to correct a typographical error. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, and 28 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 11-14, 16, 26, 27, 29-31, and 33 have been canceled by Applicants without prejudice. Claims 4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, and 28 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claim 4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because, according to the Examiner, the specification, while being enabling for some of the disclosed pH, does not reasonably provide enablement for the entire range of the claimed pH as evidenced by the abstract of *Selwyn et al.* which discloses a 5% solution of ethylenediamine having a pH of 11.5. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, and 28 all have an ethylenediamine concentration of about 0.1 to about 3.0 weight percent and a pH of the solution of about 8 to about 11. *Selwyn et al.* does not prove non-enablement for the pH values claimed because the claimed pH values are below that disclosed in *Selwyn et al.* The Examiner is respectfully reminded that the pH scale is an exponential scale and not a linear scale. Hence, *Selwyn et al.* does not indicate that an ethylenediamine concentration of 3.0 weight percent will not provide a pH value of about 11. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith M. Tackett  
Registration No. 32,008  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants